

Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee

December 1, 2003, 10 a.m. – 3 p.m.

East Bay Community Foundation Conference Center
353 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza (Near Broadway and 14th Streets)
Oakland, CA 94612

Meeting Notes

Members Present:	Bergstrom, Bero, Constable, Davis, Glantz, Gottfredson (Chair), Greenstein, Hafner, Heinecke, Jensen, Munoff, Schottlaender, Withey, Zelmanowitz
Members Absent:	Adams, Afifi, Brown, Hartford, Olsen, Pitts
Consultants & Staff:	Candee, Lawrence, Miller

1. Preliminaries

a. Welcome and introductions

MEETING OBJECTIVES:

Action Items:

- Review, revise, and endorse a SLASIAC resolution in support of construction of Phase 3 of the Southern Regional Library Facility

Review and discuss:

- Review draft strategic plan for libraries and scholarly information and advise on revisions; SLASIAC will be asked to endorse the plan at its February 20, 2004 meeting.
- Receive an update on the University Librarians' planning and implementation activities
- Receive an update on planning for the Regional Library Facilities
- Review and discuss plans and strategies for fostering change in scholarly communication
- Discuss academic uses of the UC information technology infrastructure
- Receive and discuss a demonstration of recent developments in UC Libraries shared collections and services.

2. Budget Update

Heinecke distributed the November 25, 2003 press release from President Dynes on the mid-year budget cuts proposed by the Schwarzenegger Administration and a graph

displaying the decline in average UC educational expenditures and state subsidy. Heinecke said that this year no budget request was submitted to the Regents, only a set of principles (focused on quality, access and affordability) and an outline of needs, including maintaining educational quality and access for students (per the Master Plan) [NOTE: the 2004-05 Regents' Budget is available at <http://budget.ucop.edu/>].

Heinecke said that to address the budget shortfall, the State will need to take on more debt or increase cuts in programs (or both). With a bad bond rating and several billion dollars of capital bonds already authorized (but not sold), the State may have trouble putting a new, \$15 billion bond for operating funds on the market. Regardless, the University can anticipate further cuts next year, with no increases in salaries, funding for enrollments, etc.

Glantz proposed that the University spend some money on an advertising campaign to promote the importance of the University to the state of California, and demonstrate that students are overwhelmed by jobs and money worries on top of school work. He noted that this idea would be discussed at the 12/2 meeting of the University Committee on Planning and Budget (<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/ucpb/>) and suggested that SLASIAC write a letter to Bruce Darling, Senior Vice President of University Affairs, in support of an advertising campaign.

Greenstein described what the libraries have been asked to prepare in anticipation of budget cuts. At President Dynes' request, Greenstein prepared preliminary estimates of the costs avoided as a result of the extensive collaboration and cooperation by the UC libraries on shared digital collections, facilities, and infrastructure. Greenstein subsequently prepared a second paper to describe costs that may be avoided in the future as a result of shared print collections (where electronic access is available), additional shared print collections to reduce redundancy (and which affects library building plans), shared services, planning for persistent digital access, and information that is increasingly available only in digital format (such as government publications). Greenstein noted that many libraries' special collections are comprised of ephemeral or non-traditional materials, which are increasingly available only in digital (and therefore more fleeting) format.

Gottfredson suggested that, with the Regents calling for more efficiencies, the libraries are a "poster child" for activities that successfully accomplish efficiency through cooperation and collaboration (acknowledging that it's not realistic for all areas of the University). He suggested that it would be worthwhile to look at other state systems, such as Florida and SUNY, as comparable situations in telling the libraries' story. Heinecke noted that the resources of the University of California are also resources available to the people in the state, and that it would be good to broaden the story. Hafner pointed to UC's ability to be flexible and adaptable, offer different models of information delivery, and show our capabilities as business managers in developing innovative operating models that can achieve more with fewer resources. Bero said

that it is important to get the Regents to see how scholarly communication has changed, that everything is digital now. Greenstein emphasized the importance of relating that savings come through co-investment, collaboration, and resource sharing, not through centralization. There was general consensus that (a) the key message needed to be more aggressive and forward-looking, communicating fundamental strategic (not just incremental) change; (b) the changes in scholarly communication wrought by information technology (in publishing, research, teaching/learning, the requirements and expectations of students and faculty, the importance of capturing and preserving digital content – commercial publications, Web content, the University's own “born-digital” content) are critically important and poorly understood; and (c) it is timely and important to reaffirm and re-articulate the central importance of the provision of scholarly information as an essential foundation for UC's teaching, learning, research, and service missions.

3.a.i. "Systemwide Strategic Directions" documents

Background:

- Systemwide Strategic Directions for Libraries and Scholarly Information (DRAFT, v.10, 11/21/03)
- Systemwide Strategic Directions for Libraries and Scholarly Information: Supplement on Current Budget Issues (DRAFT, v.1, 9/29/03)

Greenstein described the Systemwide Strategic Directions for Libraries and Scholarly Information document, tracing its history through the work of the SLASIAC Scholarly Information Program Task Force (2001-2002; see <http://www.slp.ucop.edu/consultation/sip/>), the thorough review and discussion of white papers on shared collections in 2002-03, and the collaborative leadership provided by the University Librarians throughout this period. Some elements that are not in the document now but will be included are: a summary of aims and objectives, actions associated with the aims, and clearer demonstration of how the strategic priorities (described in Section 4 of the strategic plan) help accomplish the aims. The document will also include more emphasis on the library user, and how past achievements have enhanced the libraries' abilities to deliver content and services.

The Committee agreed that the document held together well as a strategic plan and, rather than continuing to revise it for the many different audiences that might be addressed, the document be finalized based on comments received from ULs and SLASIAC and presented with different front matter (conceived as 1-2 page introductions) for different audiences.

The Committee agreed that the document's primary audience was the University Libraries, with EVCs and Budget and Planning Officers (who need to understand the level of interdependence that exists in the libraries) as the secondary audience. For this reason, among others, the document will attempt to quantify and provide a context for interpreting the cost avoidance resulting from collaboration (based on Greenstein's

preliminary estimates for President Dynes, discussed above) Other audiences that might be addressed (and an indication of what glosses for them might contain) include:

- The Regents, California state political entities (emphasizing how quality is dependent upon the nature and level of library provision)
- Faculty (emphasizing how through enhanced collaboration and the strategic directions indicated in the document – both past and present – libraries are able to enhance and enrich access to information and the level of personalized, timely, and relevant service)
- CIOs and other information technology officers (emphasizing how library services depend upon and may help to drive the provision of technical infrastructure supplied on a systemwide basis)
- Programs and individuals interested in changing the economics of scholarly publishing (demonstrating the extent to which costs that are avoided by libraries are swallowed up by publishers' hyper-inflationary price increases)

Other issues that came up during discussion of the strategic planning draft included:

- National rankings and statistics
- Incentives for sharing
- The diversity of the library system in terms of subjects, departments, and disciplines
- Inclusion of CSU, Community Colleges, the State
- Greater emphasis on the user experience and acknowledgement of differences in disciplinary/departmental views on needs and benefits

The interdependence of the libraries is a crucial point to emphasize because campus decision-making can have significant consequences throughout the system, but the nature and implications of this interdependence are not obvious to most UC constituencies. Specifically, Gottfredson pointed out, library budgets are no longer exclusively a campus matter or a central one, but a collaborative matter. Zelmanowitz noted that UC has not yet identified good ways to approach budget management for shared multicampus operations, especially when cutting. Heinecke emphasized the need to present libraries and access to information as an essential measure of quality of the University, on a par with the student/faculty ratio.

3. a. ii. Outcomes of the ULs' 11/19-20 planning retreat

The University Librarians met a year ago to discuss (among other topics) shared print collections. This year, the ULs focused on more specific planning for shared print collections, including definition, governance, and priorities. A group was appointed to start work on articulating the factors to be considered in planning, assessing, and implementing shared collection proposals, such as costs, collection policies and “behaviors,” campus impact, and trade-offs.

3.b.i. Regional Library Facilities Planning Task Force

The Regional Library Facilities Planning Task Force is preparing a document to be released soon. Issues addressed include:

- How RLFs, as a physical resource, can be used to further the strategies discussed in today's SLASIAC meeting
- Problems with current policies and procedures for management and budgeting of the facilities

How to integrate the RLFs into the web of activities currently underway in the libraries and library planning

3.b.ii. Southern Regional Library Facility, Phase 3

Background:

- Resolution H: Planned Expansion of Regional Storage Facilities (DRAFT, 9/30/03)

RLF budgets are administered through their host campuses (Berkeley and UCLA). While RLF capital projects are part of the Universitywide capital budget, the SRLF Phase 3 expansion falls to UCLA, and secondarily to the other Southern campuses, to advocate. SLASIAC members understand the need for Phase 3 to move ahead (SRLF will be full in 2006), but decided to wait for a more complete description of and rationale for the SRLF-3 building program before taking action on a resolution to endorse the building.

3.c. Capture and Preservation of Digital Assets

Background:

- The UC Libraries' Digital Preservation Program. Progress report, November 25, 2003 (Distributed separately)

Background material provided for informational purposes. Discussion will be scheduled for the February meeting.

4. Scholarly Communication/Faculty Communication

Greenstein described the strategies for scholarly communication as focusing on collection development in the short term, and fundamental changes in the economics of scholarly publishing in the long term.

4.b.i. Faculty Seminars on Scholarly Communication/Academic Council Task Force on Scholarly Communication

Background:

- <http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/scholarly/>

- http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/scholarly/fall_03_facultyforums.html

The two faculty seminars, one in the north and one in the south, generated lively discussion among the well-informed groups. More details about planning and actions will be presented at the February SLASIAC meeting. Meanwhile, Academic Council Chair Larry Pitts is establishing a special committee in Academic Council to address issues in scholarly communication (see the description of the Academic Council Special Committee on Scholarly Communications at <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/council/taskforces03-04.html>).

During discussion, Munoff mentioned the need to understand the full cycle of scholarly communication – that the University is both creator and consumer – and encouraged the addition of some basic illustrative scenarios to the program documents to help the audience understand the complexities of the life cycle and the effects of the proposed actions. Promotion and tenure decisions are among the issues that relate to the scholarly communication cycle. Gottfredson noted that younger faculty and post-docs need to be integrated into the discussion because they are already comfortable with digital media and more willing to entertain alternative methods of publication. Candee emphasized the importance of recognizing and addressing disciplinary differences. Glantz emphasized the need for an external assessment (i.e., peer review), for quality control. He noted that affiliation with the University of California has been helpful to him in persuading research colleagues to contribute to his Tobacco Control Archives.

5. P2P Technologies: Preserving Their Role in Scholarly Communication

Background:

Letter, Assistant Vice President Arditti to Assembly Member Cohn, September 17, 2003

Hafner gave an update on the pressure felt by the University to constrain peer-to-peer file sharing and prevent copyright infringement. Both Congress and the California legislature believe that higher education is not responsive to its concerns and those of its constituents, even though the University has communicated its policies and actions. There is a perception that the technology is feeding the illegal behavior, and that therefore the way to stop the behavior is to restrict the technology. UC is doing some restriction of bandwidth but has no intention of either monitoring the content of network communications or restraining a worthwhile technology. UC will continue to focus on privacy, good communication, and management of DMCA requirements, but Hafner asked SLASIAC for help in articulating examples of beneficial uses of P2P technology in support of the University's core mission. Candee suggested that this is an opportunity to show how technology can *enhance* scholarship.

In response to a question about fair use and downloading of digital content, Hafner noted that there is no systemwide policy on “fair” or “acceptable” use, only campus policies and guidelines (that are sometimes awkwardly divergent).

Extra item: Elsevier Negotiations Update

UC currently licenses 1,100 Elsevier titles at a price of \$8M per year, with increases of 6% per year. Elsevier titles comprise 32% of the licensed digital journal collection, 25% of use, and 52% of cost.

With the support of faculty and administrative leadership throughout the University, the libraries were able to present a strong front in negotiating with Elsevier for a new, lower priced contract. After some back-and-forth, Elsevier has provided an offer that minimally meets UC's initial requirement to not increase total expenditure over the contract period, although it does provide for annual price increases. This outcome will not solve the problem of unsustainable scholarly communication, and the libraries do not want to go through this type of negotiation again in 5 years. It is therefore still essential to work toward fundamental change in the system. Right now the University has a choice of subscribing to the whole Elsevier package at an acceptable price or to cut titles to achieve an acceptable price (since title-by-title subscription sacrifices the discounts associated with a "bundled" contract). The problem with accepting the Elsevier terms is that it diminishes the sense of crisis at a time when many faculty are involved and really care about the situation. Cutting titles makes a statement, but also denies access to publications needed for research and teaching (title cuts would be on the order of 35%). Another danger is that the campuses could conceivably end up spending more than the current total if they proceed to subscribe on a title-by-title basis at list price.

One critical question now is how to justify an escalation clause in the face of declining budgets. The fiscal situation will definitely get worse in the next couple of years, and there will have to be some trade-offs. The next move in the Elsevier negotiation is with the libraries, and they are still finalizing terms. It was the advice of the Committee that reducing titles is acceptable, that the budgetary situation has changed and that an escalation clause is no longer feasible.

6. Recent developments in UC Libraries shared collections and services

Demonstration deferred.

7. Next Meeting/Next Steps

The next SLASIAC meeting will take place February 20, 2004 in Irvine. Details will be sent out prior to the meeting.